UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/551,081 | 03/29/2007 | Qiwang Xu | 33888-400200 | 1679 |
| 27717 SEYFARTH SI | 7590 04/28/200 HAW LLP | | EXAMINER | |
| 131 S. DEARB | ORN ST., SUITE 2400 | KRISHNAN, GANAPATHY | | |
| CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1623 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/28/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/551,081 | XU ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Ganapathy Krishnan | 1623 | |

| | Ganapatny Krishnan | 1623 | |
|--|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>14 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ao no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | | FIRST REPLY WAS FI | -ED MITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t | filed within two month | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will <u>not</u> be entered be | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | TE below); | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or | • | ducing or simplifying t | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | (| |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allenon-allowable claim(s). | • | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>6-9</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | ıl and/or appellant fail | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: see continuation sheet. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Shaojia Anna Jiang, Ph.D./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1623 | | | |
| | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Applicants argue that Burton is directed to the use of a combination of hyperimmunized egg product and glucosamine while the instant invention uses only N-acetyl-D-glucosamine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof as the active agent. It cannot be expected that the effect of a combination containing two active agents can be achieved by using only a single compound that is similar to the one used in the combination. Burton does not mention the use of glucosamine derivatives nor the use of N-acetyl-D-glucosamine. This is not found to be persuasive.

The fact that it canot be expected that the effect pf a combination containing two active agents can be achieved by use of only a single compound being somewhat similar to one active agent in the combination is aan opinion. Applicants have not provided any supporting evidence for the same. Burton specifically teaches that the novel feature of his invention is the use of N-acetyl glucosamine so that it can provide for the fornation of of essential tissue components whose deficiency is a major facet of the autoimmune disease, psoriasis (col. 2, lines 53-59). Burton also cites the teaching of Meisneer and Hendry regarding the use of N-acetyl-D-glucosamine for cell growth (col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 1, lines 11-16). Hence, there is a suggestion by Burton regarding the use of N-acetyl-D-glucosamine and its benefecial effects. From this teaching it iwould be obvious to the skilled artisan that N-acetyl-D-glucosamine will exert the intended effect as instanlty claimed irrespective of whether it is the only active agent present or if it is present in a combination.

The rejection is being maintained.